

From Noise to Bruit in Organization Communication: Roaming with French Knowledge/Theory

Che Mahzan Ahmad

Organizational Communication Division, Department of Communication
International Islamic University of Malaysia P.O. Box 10, 50728 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Abstract: Noise is a problem in organization communication that moves along Anglo-Saxon configurations of knowledge. In that system, inspired by the received doctrine of Shannon and Weaver model of communication, noise must be excluded in and from a relationship. In French knowledge/theory, noise is a bruit. At the hand of Serres, bruit becomes an energy of interference and difference to the system via various morphing, bruit = parasite = Venusian third (wo) man = joker. The new knowledge landscape is possible via anti-method as a way about. Anti-method rejects the two cultures paradigm. For Serres the traditional methodology promotes closure, repetition and predictability. As a method that invents, anti-method pivotal axis is mixtures (metissage). In this engagement, one is mixing with circum-tances of the past and the present, culture and sciences, concepts and data, subjects and objects through connective intellection action. Randonnee, an exodic wanderings based upon non-linear dynamical system, is compulsory before one is able to harvest new meanings and energy. Practically, organization communication practitioners as intellectual operators must adhere to the grammar of Hermes and the grammar of the educated third as architectonic of organizing. With French knowledge/theory, organization communication is moving from the old pleats and folds of old knowledge into a third living where operators no longer feel the same wind, same waves or the same shores as before.

Key words: Serres • Anti-method • French knowledge/theory • Organization communication • Noise • Exodic

INTRODUCTION

For long, Anglo-Saxon or North American knowledge configurations shaped organizational communication development (OCD) practitioners' mind. In that realm of confidence French knowledge/theory is frequently marginalized or even been rejected without much detailed criticism, 'often citing its alleged pervasive and multiform danger [1]. At times, only selective, not the whole, French elements are 'captivated' as 'the object of taste' that is being appreciated for their 'uniqueness' [2]. It seems French knowledge/theory is not in the metaphysic of presence but symbolically bracketed forms of life [3]. Consequently, French knowledge/theory ended up in black-boxes [4] or only as parts of a larger discipline. For example, in the United States, it is common to find French philosophy being nestled quietly within a department of literature. 'Should

Montaigne's be classified as literature or philosophy?' asked Serres, one of key philosopher of this century [5-8].

Basically, the term 'French knowledge/theory' is referring to a supposition or a system of ideas intended to explain something as put forward or suggested by French authors beginning in the 1960's. According to Cusset, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Felix Guattari, Giles Deleuze, Jean-Francois Lyotard, Jean Baudrillard and Roland Barthes are the backbones of French knowledge/theory [9]. Lamont, Chiapello and Baker and Biagioli lists of grantees include Louis Althusser, Paul Ricouer and Michel Serres [10-12]. Cronin and Meho reiterated that there is no French knowledge/theory per se as the French themselves never conceived of it as such [13]. The term is indeed an American creation [14]. Perhaps, the production is a kind of labelling for the Other in the 'land of empiricism.'

In the context of organization communication, the 'French knowledge/theory' is now making a footprint of its own and it is flourishing under the 'Montreal School' with James Taylor and associates as key figures [15, 16]. A manifestation of the above type of venture is clearly visible in a forum edited by Coreen and Grosjean [17]. An interesting overview about the state of 'new knowledge' on organization communication as arising out of the French knowledge/theory is explicitly shown in Carayol, Hardy and Agostinelli and Hardy [18, 19, 20]. At the moment, scholars with 'French' inclination are growing via conferences and seminars that devote to 'communicative constitution of organization'.

For this article, French knowledge/theory is largely drawn from works of Michele Serres, one of the most original French philosophers [21]. Serres thinking and method are said to be shaped and coloured by three personalities, Bachelard, Leon Brillouin and Jacques Monod. Bachelard is a philosopher of science with a background in physic and the author of *The Psychoanalysis of Fire*. Brillouin, a physicist, is the writer of *Science and Information Theory*. Monod, a biologist, is the author of *Chance and Necessity*. *Le Parasite*, published in 1982, is considered to be Serres representative work.

Noise in the old landscape of knowledge. With reference to Shannon and Weaver's 'model' of communication [22], noise is an issue in mechanistic-modern paradigmatic OCD. Here, noise is an error and it is a disorder to the existed 'modern' references and footnotes. Positivistically, noises are manifestation of miscommunication. In this 'effects' understanding, 'noises' are unwanted turbulences, not a 'delicious' one.

A point to note, Shannon and Weaver model is a kind of 'received doctrine' in communication studies [23]. The model action system, based upon telegraphy, is operating from two stations. In that operation, dual modes of sending/receiving back and forth are at work. It can be formulated as follows: the received signal E is a function of the transmitted signal S and the variable N, so that $E = f(S, N)$. As a linear model, it reduces the system of communication to its individual parts where each is functioning as a separate entity. Simply said, each individual component of the model is part of a larger system that is in the context of a network of relations [24]. The term system is to refer to any set of interrelated parts that can influence and control one another through communication and feedback loops. Communication in the above sense is therefore about the exchange of messages between two interlocutors. It is being grounded

upon Platonic dialogical method. Contextually, communication is about a movement of exchanging messages between two stations (A and B) that pass through a channel (C). It is a sort of game played by A and B against the phenomena of interference and confusion coming out from C.

Shannon and Weaver model posits that an information from which issues a message to a transmitter that sends a signal through a channel for the receiver. Shannon postulates that signals contain one intended/actual message and numerous non-intended/possible messages. Therefore, the actual message is the selected one out of many possible signals. Therefore, the message represents a choice between ranges of possible alternatives. In this logic, uncertainty that arises by virtue of freedom of choice on the part of the sender is desirable uncertainty. Similarly, uncertainty out of errors is undesirable uncertainty. Hence, the problem of noise is a question of selection. Meaning to say, noise is the return of unselected alternative the effects of increasing uncertainty [25].

Succinctly, noise in the realm of 'old' landscape of knowledge is an error of relation between the transmitter and receiver and it is being introduced by channel into the system. The action is unaccountable as the channel is memory-less [26]. In this position, the channel becomes the key condition for, or limit on, information. Simply, in the realm of old knowledge noise is the unwanted additional data without meaning in the system; noise is an anti-life force and an 'enemy' of information' [27].

Noise in the new landscape of knowledge. Bruit is an old French cognate for the Anglo-Saxon noise. In depth, bruit parallel situation does not exist in English. The best meaning for bruit is 'the furore, the tumultuousness of things and rivalries dissension.' Serres in *Le Parasite* [28] observed the nature of bruit as noise as follows: At the feast everyone is talking. At the door of the room there is a ringing noise, the telephone. Communication cuts conversations, the noise interrupting messages. As soon as I speak with the new interlocutor, the sound of the banquet becomes noise for the new of us. A given noise, the sound of conversation in the room, is a noise for conversation I am having with my interlocutors, but it is a message for my guests. And for them my conversation is a noise of its own ... The city rat invites the country rat onto the Persian rug. He has produced nothing and the dinner invitation cost him almost nothing. Their royal feast is only a meal among the dirty dishes of a table that has not been cleared. But the feast is cut short. Both rats

scurry off when they hear a noise at the door. It was only a noise, but it is also a message, a bit of information producing panic: an interruption, a corruption, a rupture of information. What happened? The master is there; he has heard the noise. He opens the door. No one. The rats have left. Who then make the noise? The rats, of course. A feast makes noise. All that wakes him up. The noise, then, was called for noise. At the door of the room, he heard a noise. He gets up; the rats flee [29].

Noise aka bruit, as explained by Serres, is about a system of welcoming or unwelcoming. The ringing of phone is unwelcome noise for diners as it interrupts their welcoming noisy conversations. However, in answering the phone call one is receiving a 'welcoming' noise aka message of its own right. Here, a message can be a noise or static that disrupts the orderly proceedings of another communicative action. Serres posited that messages that flow between the sender (station A) and the receiver of message (station B) are different in some way, not identical. If messages are entirely identical at the moment of communicative action there would be no message. A message via some process of mediation passes back and forth from both stations with some effects.

Creatively, sending and receiving messages are spatial performances between two adjacent or contagious parties, A and B [30-31]. C lies in between of both A and B. A, B and C in the above circumstances are units. Serres pointed that modern man is very fascinated with unit and only unity of units seem rational to him. 'A, B and C is a classification or partition that resulted in islands of stability. It is being assumed that when both A and B are united there will be no interruption/noise and the communication is said to be efficient, stable, safe, proper and formally mapped'[32]. In such a maximally united efficient situation, A – B communication tends to be A-A communication, a phenomenon of blank chaos [33]. A point to note, both A and B are said to be living in their own solipsistic world (spaces) and they are trying not to communicate. A hears B's noise when A is silent and B hears A's noise when B is silent. In the above moment of exclusiveness and efficiency, both A and B are in the state of terminal equilibrium and information death [34]. In this regard, the channel carries the flow, but it cannot disappear as a channel, it brakes the flow, more or less' [35]. In the nutshell, a 'successful' communication in Platonic dialogical activity is the exclusion of C = noise. In that sense-making, an optimally 'successful' and perfect action between two stations means a relation is disappearing. 'It is there, if it exists, that means it failed.

It is not a relation but just mediation. A relation in a perfect, successful optimum communication therefore is non-relation and that is what the parasite is.

Topographically, to be or not to be noise relates with certain markers or lines of inclusion and exclusion in a certain space of acceptance or rejection. Simply noise-space relationship prevailed in the configuration that relates to a system or community as represented by dining table and the phone; here is the message but elsewhere is the noise. Thus partition in the space defines what is and what not noise is. Having all the above, we theorize noise, upon reading Serres', into a series of metamorphosis: noise aka bruit = parasite = Venusian third(wo)man = the joker.

Noise aka bruit is a parasite. In French, a parasite has three meanings: 1) a social creature that feeds without paying (social parasite); 2) a biological guest like a virus (biological parasite); and 3) a static or noise that interferes with a signal. The English parasite corresponds only to the first two meanings in French. Lawrence R. Schehr who translated *Le Parasite* into English as *The Parasite* noted that noise as parasite is an additional resonance in the French which is not translatable into English.

In *The Rats Meal*, Serres writes: The tax farmer produced nothing neither oil nor ham nor cheese; in fact he produced nothing. But by using the power of law, he can profit from these products. Likewise for the city rat who takes the farmer's leftovers. And the last to profit is the country rat. The tax farmer is parasite, living off the fat of the land; a royal feast, ortolans and Persian rugs. The first rat is the parasite; for him leftovers the same Persian rug. At the table of the farmer, the second rat is the parasite. The custom house officer makes life hard for the working man, the rat taxes the farmer and the guest exploits the host [36].

In the above parasitic chain, the last to come tries to supplant his predecessor. It is a kind of cascading or pecking in order; a given parasite seeks to eject the parasite on the level immediately superior of its own. Here, being parasitic is basically about interrupt living in a system. The system build upon a network of relations that obeys a certain set of rules, it is given. Parasitism is integral to the functioning of the system. Serres noted that the system works because it does not work [37], at least as understood by modernists. The system works by interceptions and breakdowns and it operates in the state flow of togetherness with 'stations, paths, points and lines, beings and relations'. In that flow there will be interceptions or accidents that give changes or metamorphoses to the said relation and relationship.

The new landscape then may vibrate with polyphonic voices of certain or different order.

Noise aka bruit = parasite = the Venusian third (wo) man. Sender, receiver and signal/noise are three related units/interlocutors. Steve Brown observed that the all three speak with one another and they interrupt each other [38]. In that logic, between the sender and the receiver is a space. Reflexively, Brown's observation brought another Brown, namely George Spencer-Brown [39] to mind. In his calculus of indication, Spencer-Brown showed that there are always three values to the two sides of one distinction: inside, outside and the dividing and deferring, line itself. In other words, in a relation there are three living spaces. Contextually, it is in the third space where noise lives. For Serres, a space, all space, any space, whether it is biological, geo-physical, socio-political or epistemological, is composed of the multiple. In that perspective, the local space is not individuated, but a place of play and interplay that carry ambiguities, expectations and predictions. In space C, noise aka bruit is the parasite is the third (wo) man.

As the third (wo) man, (s) he should acts with science of Venus that moves with the physics of vortices, sweetness and smiling voluptuousness, a soft movement intertwined lovers. With Venus, a science of caresses valorises the stochastic process of relations, away from the warlike science of Mars. In this regard, the third (wo) man is not strictly tied to classification, straight and regular geometries. Instead, noise aka bruit = parasite = the third (wo) man is embracing Mandelbrot's fractals reality, with their swirls and their turbulences. It is a reality, formed of pools of fish, filled in turn with fish and pools [40]. Serres narrates: Venus is a beauty born in and from the turbulent waves, who emerges fully formed, still dripping and therefore attached to the noise of the sea. Indeed Venus is 'la belle noiseuse' (the beautiful noisy one, the beautiful troublesome one). In this regard, Venus is an order born from disorder. For Venus, chaos is part of her make-up. Her form is exceptional that lives in a sea of probabilities. Therefore, the delicious noise of Venus is the beauty [41]. Assad noted that Venus is an operator of mixed bodies [42].

As mentioned above, Venus produces '*turbulente*'. At this point, enlightenment from the realm of fluid mechanics is essential. "Turbulence is closely related with laminar flow. In laminar flow, all idealized fluid particles move more or less smoothly in the same direction and at the same speed. In turbulence flow, the particles move in many different directions and at different speeds. In turbulence, energies are generated at the

largest scales r whorls. This is much like a large cloud of bubbles that leave the water pump and enter a swimming pool. The structure of the whirling motion is at first quite large. Then the large whorls begin to break into smaller and smaller patches or bursts of turbulent energy. Eventually the bubbles dissipate or disappear in the pool and seemingly, equilibrium returns. This disappearance is due to the existence of viscosity, internal property of fluid that offers resistance to flow, in the water, that is, the viscosity drain the energy away" [43].

As seen, noise aka bruit = parasite = the Venusian third (wo) man is opening up new path where a new kind of exchange is possible. With Venus, the noise aka bruit is re-directing the flow of production and creates a new direction for a system. The turbulente creates a pocket where the local flows are being cut off from their uniform paths.

Noise aka bruit = parasite = the Venusian third(wo)man = the joker. The last morphing for noise is to be the joker, the wild card. The joker is necessary to the system. It takes on any value, becomes unpredictable and turns the system into instability. Again, it is worth to remember that the system works because it does not work. The joker is the principle of non-linearity. Whenever we expect certain things to happen, a joker may be responsible for producing a bifurcation or a deviation, a singularity, which not only runs counter these expectations but creates new ones. The joker interrupts by creating new link. It seems natural, yet it is an art. It establishes a parasitic relationship to an already existing relation. Thereby it creates a new possibility at a place where everybody else has come to terms with existing relationships. The joker disturbs the expected course of events and presents a new, unexpected possibility [44].

(Anti) methodology. Appreciating noise as bruit with what method? Method crosses the desert easily but is hindered by the country, every place is an obstacle. A method traces a route, a way, a path. Where are we going, where do we come from and which way we are going? In the realm of 'old knowledge', the term method suggests the notion of repetition, predictability and mastery. For Serres, such method implies closure to invention.

Harari and Bell termed Serres' method as 'anti-method that invents' [45]. It is a method that concerns with motion and flow that transverse the boundaries of multidisciplinary methods and methodologies [46]. In the above sense, 'anti-method' counters the dogmatism of traditional methodology that catholically upholds unified, singular and systematic knowledge arising out from the

notion of repetition, mastery and closure. Latour pointed that 'anti-method' operates with a philosophy that rejects divides, divisions, categorizations and classifications [47]. In the context of knowledge production, anti-method is fundamentally tied with searching 'north-west passages' rather than bogged down with 'trail of errors corrected at last' [48].

Serresian 'anti-method' grammar begins with a thinking of 'not too sure' about established science/knowledge or definitive beliefs, opinions and evidences. As such being 'literalist' is not part of 'anti-method'. A 'passion for the extraction of a set from its complement' that moves with 'a reversal of foreground and background' is widely appreciated. Perhaps, in that celebration a new meaning is revealing and resurrecting. In 'anti-method', a gestalt switch is the key to unlock hidden and interesting knowledge where reshuffling of arguments around rationalism and irrationalism take place. For Ma Ming-Qian, 'anti-method can be classified as a form of critical-exploratory inquiry [49]. Pilz placed Serres 'anti-method' in the postmodern box [50]. Perhaps, anti-method is a 'noology' [51] at work. Anti-method fundamentals, among others, are 'mixtures' and 'randonee'.

Mixtures. For Serres, it is a crisis to accept singularity and rift between exact sciences and human sciences. Serresian mixing basically revolves around circum-tances, of the past and present, culture and science, concepts and data, subjects and objects [52]. Interestingly, by this action of mixing bodies Serres becomes so naïve to the point that he cannot tell whether Herge of the famous Tintin comic strip or Habermas as a better analyst of communication [53]. The failure is related his understanding of 'cross-over whereby characters of one language are crossed with attributes of another origin' in order to produce 'a local Pentecost; he believes in what has been reversed, he wavers, he fiddles and he sees the irreversible as reversible that is in the context of emancipating the people and the mind from the tyranny of negation so much so the world is innocent as well as positive and new with no camps or divides' [54]. In that mode of working, there is 'no centre, no substitution of one meta-language that would over-master, over-coming or out-witting the others' [55].

What being said by Latour should be taken literally as mixing is not about anything goes though as it is a work of intellection where one sorts, selects, adds and subtracts details. For Serres, mixing is an action with multiple, connective intellection. Here, intellection does not only mean to act intelligently, or with our intellect, but

also to be intelligent, or to be intellectual. Such way of doing is related to the notion of methodology; work of research is always, without any exception, also a work of thought. By taking intellection, mixing becomes a practice that goes beyond and away from the exclusivity and rigidities of traditional method and the blind spots created by it towards more comprehensive approach [56].

Randonnee. In French, randonnee means a quite long and difficult walk. In English, random is related with chance. In conceptualizing randonnee, Serres use both meanings albeit direction taken and the used time. For Serres the method is the journey and the aim of a randonnee is not to establish relations between different domains but to mix philosophical with scientific contents or to discover analogies via a formal set of operations of interferences, transformation, translations and passages. Serres compares the randonnee with the Odyssey of Ulysses which is full of wanderings where one explores, perceives, listens, collects, making sense, discover unknown relations, dimensions, stories that never be discovered or felt with the methodological straight forward methodology [57]. Serres argues that straight forward methodology is following the Cartesian path, an algebra structured by the relationship of order underlined by the economic strategy of extremum-optimum. In much normality, Cartesian path determines our rationality and rectitude.

In relation to the above, Serres noted that we have also inherited non-economic pathways outside this order as seen in the Odyssey. This Odyssean path is an exodus in the sense that the path deviates from the straight line path and the track goes off track. "The exodus moves away from the equilibrium and Ulysses thus submits to the fluctuation of the sea, wind and waves. His boat is subjected to moments of calm, tornadoes and the whirlpools. Off the beaten track he is trapped in other forms of stability. As if a river, diverted from its customary bed, were to meet a plateau and form a lake, remaining there for a certain time before returning to the preordained course. As if there existed an order outside order. Remote in relation to its methodical path, this order is being created through fluctuation. This different order could well be called exodic. You never find this with a methodical approach; method minimises constraints and cancel them out, exodus throws itself into their disorder" [58].

In effect, randonnee is being modelled upon non-linear dynamical system. In a linear life world, the universe is assumed to be a mechanical system composed of bodies as machine. Proponents are talking about

turning curves into a series of straight lines or at the very least, simpler curves, throwing data which did not fit. Here, the whole is equal to sum of its parts. Thus the problem can be broken into smaller pieces. Once the problem is solved, all the pieces can be added together to their original position. Linear determinism emphasizes that A causes B causes C, a prediction can be made next and one can control the outcomes. Whilst, non-linear assumes that the sum of the parts can be more or less than the whole. The emphasis is on the relationships of the parts and the whole. Things happen for reason but the web of events is complex and a single cause can be rarely identified in understanding what occurs in the world around us. Thus in non-linear dynamical system, there is no such thing as exact prediction or weak restrictions on scientific ability to know, control, predict and reduce [59]. Simply, in randonnee the stochastic and unpredictable nature of design of work is living with multiplicities inherent both in organization and thought.

Organization communication development practitioners should be what? With all noises made in the above paragraphs, we posit organizational communication development (OCD) practitioners should be intellectual operators. In this respect, operators are sensible learners that learn to accept becoming. Basically becoming is a process that moves and develops for a new knowledge. In becoming, one is folding and unfolding lines where the knotting, netting and pleating of different materials and organs are in constant enduring process of stability/instability or order/disorder. In this circumstances 'anti-method' imagination is highly celebrated. Thus, becoming should be read as a generative dance of creative imagination. For the above purpose, we suggest practitioners should embrace two organizing grammars of imagination, at least.

The grammar of Hermes. Hermes is a key figure in Serres' writings. This mythical person-god travels across space and time, making connections between objects, persons and events. 'Hermes produces a relation among mixtures'[60]. Indeed, Serres ideas on philosophy of communication are modelled after Hermes, the messenger of the gods in Greek mythology: Zeus was mutilated by the monster Typhoon. Hermes came and save him from death. In ensuring the system to work, Hermes re-assembled missing parts 'tendons' by re-attaching them to the main body. In this mutilation is inscribed the blockage of circulation and Hermes reactivates the system. Hermes is the re-connector [61]. We theorise the figure of Hermes, guided by *Hermes: Literature, Science, Philosophy* as follows:

Theory: Hermes is an active participant in understanding cosmos complexities. For intellectual operators it means that one needs to understand life-world that undergoes change. It is an action of dynamic appreciation. "The totality of our practices and our culture has fallen into the bloody hand of Mars. Since there is no ant-strategic strategy that itself a strategy, the god of war is always triumphant. Hermes position in this opposition is clear and he is concerned with the perseveration of qualities inherent in life" [62].

Theory: Intellectual operators must embrace love and wisdom in handling the culture of change. "The ancestor of Ulysses deciphers the future through signs traced on the ground. Hermes calls intention to the myriad spaces in which we live. He is the philosopher of plural spaces; connects, disconnects and reconnects the variety of spaces. What is closed? What is open? What is the connective path? What is a tear? What are the continuous and discontinuous? What is the threshold, a limit? The image of the weaver arises at this point; to link, to tie, to open bridges, pathways, wells or relays among different spaces; to say what takes place between them; to inter-dict in the rupture and cracks between varieties. At the same points, Hermes, the protector of boundaries, links with Penelope; Hermes turns weaver of spaces" [63].

Theory: In line with Hermesian epistemology of space, intellectual operators must engage themselves as weavers who work with all 'leaves, layers and geological formations'. It is an engagement with spatial varieties of various domains and discourses, spoken and unspoken voices. Operators therefore must conduct themselves with multiplicity, not singularity. At some paths or stages, operators must not forget their own localities. It is about moving across boundaries without burning bridges. As such, intellectual operators must be a keen topographer. "Hermes is the messenger of the gods. He must know the terrain, over which he journeys, the shortcuts, the landmarks, many paths. He must be able to decode the map, the dangers that topography hides. It is not enough to know how to decode; one also must know how to hide" [64].

The grammar of the educated third. An educated third is a troubadour who appreciates ideas on crossbreeding of sciences with non-sciences. (S) he makes love with mixtures, with 'here and there' that celebrates multiplicity of spaces and times. In that inter-course (s) he becomes a lover of rivers, sands,

winds, seas, mountains. The educated third is a navigator of the Northwest Passage where scientific knowledge communicates with arts and humanities. Simply, (s)he represents the value of tolerance for mixtures and differences and it is done with creativity and imagination for wisdom, invention and love. It is an action that 'rejects dualism of reason/emotion, theory/practice, science/arts and so on' [65]. Indeed, a single body is no longer attractive as compared to mixed bodies. After all, a mixture 'can be named neither by nouns, too stable, nor by adjective, too juxtaposed, but are most accurately described by all the prepositions together: before and after their viscous fluidity; with and without, the hesitating divisions; over and under, the false and true subject; for and against, the violent passions; behind and before, the cowardly hypocrisies and courageous loyalties; in and outside of, the corporeal and theoretical, social and professional claustrophobia; between and beyond, the metaphysical vocation of the archangel-messenger; from and via and toward, my furor to travel' [66].

CONCLUSION

According to Serres, organization lives between order and noise, between disorder and perfect harmony. If there were only order, he said, we only heard perfect harmonies; our stupidity would soon fall down toward dreamless sleep [67]. In normal Anglo-Saxon knowledge circumstances, noise destroys and horrifies order and it is a problem in mechanistic planned organizational change program. In the realm of French knowledge/theory, as represented by Serres' *bruit* = parasite = Venusian third (wo) man = joker, noise is not that bad as it creates many opportunities and possibilities, a producer of positive chaos. Metaphorically Serres is seeing the oak in the noise. At the hand of Serres, communication is heuristic resource for oneself to do a voyage for discovery of answers. In this respect, *bruit* as a cognate of Anglo-Saxon noise provides means of energizing the system.

However this new view provided by the new knowledge via French theory is not possible without taking anti-method as its methodology. Basically, anti-method is opposed to the idea of linear dynamism as the only way of knowing and making knowledges. Serres' anti-method is largely feeds with polyphonic voices of humanities, arts and sciences. Here, the 'two cultures' division, where sciences and arts are separated, is not acceptable. Anti-method does not recognize

dichotomies in knowledge and it invents via new translation and connections through science, arts and humanities. Under the prerogative of intellection, all mingled bodies are being re-evaluated for a commonly held ideas and assumptions. It is an act of nurturing the multiple for a belief that singularity is not always right and true. This thought of multiplicity that challenges Newtonian-Cartesian hegemony is rooted in new physics that loves fractal curves and strange attractors. In this new passion, you no longer feel the same wind, no longer see the same waves or the same shores as before' [68]. Succinctly, there is 'life outside the linear science and 'reason is distributed everywhere and no one can claim exclusive rights to it' [69]. In sum, the third way knots the threads and makes the creation of cloth possible and beautiful [70]. Surely, the above beauty of the third culture is just an illusion if practitioners do not accept two grammars of organizing that revolve around Hermesian way of life and Ulysses spirit of travelling. As such doing *randonnee*, moving into uncharted, unfamiliar waters with mixtures at hand is a highly recommended operation. In that roaming, the poem and the theorem, experimentation and experience' become passionate lovers.

For intellectual operators, taking linear and non-linear dynamical system together is a new play to articulate passages that would drive formation of new complexities, new stories, new theories and points. Indeed, by so doing intellectual operators are living beyond the old pleats and folds that coloured and shaped the old knowledges.

Reflexively, am I all this while being misled by the Anglo-Saxon knowledge makers about noise? Is there local way of understanding noise? After all multiplicities is not new in my own Malay culture: *Dalam kilat ada kilau, dalam kilau ada cahaya* (In the twinkle there is a glow and in the glow there is light). *Oui, get out from the Plato' cave and lets the new knowledge comes.*

REFERENCE

1. Biagioli, M., 2001. From Difference to Blackboxing. French Theory versus Science Studies' Metaphysics of Presence. In Sylvère Lotringer and Sande Cohen (Eds.). French Theory in America. Routledge.
2. Ferrer, C., 2012. Data Mining the Humanities. The Impact of 'French theory' on Literary Studies. International Journal of Information and Education Technology, (4): 374-377.
3. Biagioli, 2001, pp: 284.

4. Jones, C., 2003. Theory of Postmodern Condition. *Organization*, 10(3): 503-525.
5. Mortley, R., 1991. *French Philosophers in Conversation*. Routledge.
6. Sibghatullah Nasir, 2013. Microfinance in India Contemporary Issues and Challenges. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 15(2): 191-199.
7. Mueen Uddin, Asadullah Shah, Raed Alsaqour and Jamshed Memon, 2013. Measuring Efficiency of Tier Level Data Centers to Implement Green Energy Efficient Data Centers, *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 15(2): 200-207.
8. Hossein Berenjeian Tabrizi, Ali Abbasi and Hajar Jahadian Sarvestani, 2013. Comparing the Static and Dynamic Balances and Their Relationship with the Anthropometrical Characteristics in the Athletes of Selected Sports, *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 15(2): 216-221.
9. Cusset, F., 2008. *French Theory. How Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze and Company Transformed the Intellectual Life of the United States*. University of Minnesota Press.
10. Lamont, M., 1987. How to become a dominant French philosopher the case of Jacques Derrida. *American Journal of Sociology*, 3: 584-622.
11. Chiapello, E. and C.R. Baker, 2011. The Introduction of French Theory into English Language Accounting Research. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 24(2): 140-160.
12. Bagioli, 2001, pp: 283.
13. Cronin, B. and L.I. Meho, 2009. Receiving the French: A Bibliometric Snapshot of the Impact of French Theory on Information Studies. *Journal of Information Science*, 35(4): 398-413.
14. Lotringer, S. and S. Cohen, 2001. *French Theory in America*. Routledge.
15. Taylor, J. and E. Van Every, 2000. *The Emergent Organization. Communication as its Site and Surfaces*. New Jersey.
16. Cooren, F., J. Taylor and E. Van Every, 2006. *Communication as Organizing*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
17. Cooren, F. and S. Grosjean, 2010. *Organization Communication in France*. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(4): 607-611.
18. Carayol, V., 2004. The Allagmatic Approach. A New Perspective in Organizational Communication. A paper presented at 11th BledCommunication Conference, Bled, Slovenia.
19. Hardy, M. and S. Agostinelli, 2008. What is an Organization? In *Materiality, Agency and Discourse*, ICA Pre-Conference, Montreal, Canada, pp: 21-22.
20. Hardy, M., 2009. History and Trends of French Research on Organizational Communication. A paper presented at Chinese Conference on Organizational Communication, Wenzhou, December, pp: 19-20.
21. Hagemeyer, R.E., 2005. *The Unmasking of the Other*. Erasmus RIM
22. Shannon, C.F. and W. Weaver, 1949. *Mathematical Model of Communication*. University of Illinois Press.
23. Hayles, N.K. and J. Pullizzi, 2010. Narrating Consciousness Language, Media and Embodiment. *History of Human Sciences*, 23(3): 131-148.
24. Cascone, K., 2005. *Parasite and Noise*. Anechoicmedia Pacifica, pp: 8.
25. Martin, N., 2012. Noise story. From Noise Theory to Theory's Noise. Available dare.uva.nl/document/355133. Retrieved on 10/9/2013.
26. Kockleman, P., 2010. Enemies, Parasites and Noise. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 20(2): 406-421.
27. Weaver, W., 1967. *Selected Papers*. Basic.
28. Serres, 1982. *Le Parasite*. University of Minnesota Press.
29. Serres, 1982, pp: 66.
30. Lionett, F., 1992. Mangoes and Maroons. In Sidone Smith and Julia Watson (Eds.). *De/Colonising, The Subject*. University of Minnesota Press.
31. Stevenson, F.W., 2004. Becoming Mole(cular), Becoming Noise. *Concentric*, 30: 3-36.
32. Kockleman, 2010, pp: 410.
33. Stevenson, 2004, pp: 16.
34. Stevenson, 2004, pp: 9-15.
35. Serres, 1982, pp: 79.
36. Serres, 1982, pp: 3-5.
37. Serres, 1982, pp: 79.
38. Brown, S.D., 2004. Parasite Logic. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(4): 383-395.
39. Spencer-Brown, G., 1969. *Calculus of Indication*. Allen and Unwin.
40. Mindell, D.A., 1990. Fractals, Parasites and the Third Man. *IEEE*. 89CH293: 278-283.
41. Rosenberg, T.E., 2007. Delicious Turbulence. *Studies in Material Thinking*, 1(1): 1177-6234.
42. Assad, M.L., 1991. From Order to Chaos: Michel Serres' Field Models. *Substance*, 65: 33-43.
43. Catalano, G., 2012. Turbulent Fluid Mechanics. In Caroline Bailei, Alice Pawley and Dona Riley (Eds.). *Engineering and Social Justice*. Purdue University Press.
44. Baecker, D., 2002. The Joker in the Box. *Cybernetics and Human Knowing*, 9: 39-62.
45. Harari, J.V. and D.F. Bell, 1982. Introduction *Journal a Plusieurs Voies*. In Michel Serres. *Hermes*. The John Hopkins University Press.

46. Ma, M., 2008. Poetry as Re-reading. Northwestern University Press.
47. Latour, B., 1987. The Enlightenment Without the Critique. A Word on Michel Serres' Philosophy. In Phillips Griffiths (Ed.). Contemporary French Philosophy. Cambridge University Press.
48. Egea-Kuehne, D., 2008. Serres' New Landscape of Knowledge. A paper presented at 11th International Conference on ISSEL. Language Centre, University of Helsinki, 28 July – 2 August.
49. Ma, 2008.
50. Pilz, K., 2005. Mapping Complexity. Troubador.
51. De Beer, C.S., 2011. Methodology and Noology. South Africa Journal for Libraries and Information System, 77(1): 88-89.
52. Assad, M.L., 1999. Reading with Michel Serres. State University of New York Press.
53. Latour, 1987.
54. Latour, 1987, pp: 91.
55. Latour, 1987, pp: 90.
56. De Beer, 2011, pp: 88-89.
57. Assad, M.L., 1999. Reading with Michel Serres. State University of New York Press.
58. Serres, M., 2008. The Five Senses. Continuum.
59. Smith, C., 1999. Non-linear Science and the Post-positivist Researcher. On-line at www.netweed.com/cr/nonpost.pdf. Retrieved on 10/10/2013.
60. Serres, 1982.
61. Harari and Bell, 1982, pp: xxxi-xxxii.
62. Harari and Bell, 1982, pp: xxxii.
63. Harari and Bell, 1982, pp: xxxiii, 54-55.
64. Harari and Bell, 1982, pp: xxxiv-xxxv.
65. Zembylas, M., 2002. Of Troubadours, Angels and Parasites. International Journal of Education and Arts, 3: 3.
66. Serres, M., 1997. The Troubadour of Knowledge. University of Michigan Press.
67. Serres, M., 1982, pp: 127.
68. Serres, M., 1995. Genesis. University of Michigan Press.
69. Pireddu, N., 2001. Toward Poet(h)ics of Techne. Annali d'Italianistica, 19: 189-214.
70. Egea-Kuehne, 2008.